

*The Education  
Fiscal Accountability and Oversight Act  
of 2004*

*Local School System Master Plan  
Annual Update Budget Review*

*January 2005*



*Maryland State Department of Education  
Division of Business Services*

## Maryland State Board of Education

Member	Residence	Term Ends
Edward L. Root, <i>President</i>	Allegany County	2007
Dunbar Brooks, <i>Vice President</i>	Baltimore County	2005
Lelia Thompson Allen	Charles County	2006
Jo Ann T. Bell	Prince George's County	2006
J. Henry Butta	Anne Arundel County	2008
Beverly A. Cooper	Baltimore City	2008
Calvin D. Disney	Baltimore County	2007
Rev. Clarence A. Hawkins	Kent County	2005
Karabelle Pizzigati	Montgomery County	2005
Maria C. Torres-Queral	Baltimore County	2007
David F. Tufaro	Baltimore City	2008
Brian A. Williamson, <i>Student Member</i>	Washington County	2005

## Maryland State Department of Education

Nancy S. Grasmick  
*Secretary-Treasurer of the Board*  
*State Superintendent of Schools*

A. Skipp Sanders  
*Deputy State Superintendent for Administration*

Richard J. Steinke  
*Deputy State Superintendent for Instruction and Academic Acceleration*

Ronald A. Peiffer  
*Deputy State Superintendent for Academic Policy*

Mary Clapsaddle  
*Assistant State Superintendent for Business Services*

## State of Maryland

Robert L. Erhlich, Jr.  
*Governor*

Michael S. Steele  
*Lieutenant Governor*

## Table of Contents

	Page
SB 894: Report on the Budget Review of the Annual Master Plan Updates	1
Attachment A: Local School System Budget Analysis	
Allegany	7
Anne Arundel	9
Baltimore City	11
Baltimore County	13
Calvert	15
Caroline	17
Carroll	19
Cecil	21
Charles	23
Dorchester	25
Frederick	27
Garrett	29
Harford	31
Howard	33
Kent	35
Montgomery	37
Prince George's	39
Queen Anne's	41
St. Mary's	43
Somerset	45
Talbot	47
Washington	49
Wicomico	51
Worcester	53
Attachment B: Glossary	55



## **Introduction and Background**

The General Assembly enacted Senate Bill 856, the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act*, on April 4, 2002. On May 6, 2002, the Act was signed into law restructuring Maryland's public school finance system and increasing State Aid to public schools by an estimated \$2.2 billion over six fiscal years (FY 2003-2008). The new finance structure, modeled after the recommendations of the Commission on Education Finance, Equity, and Excellence (Thornton Commission), ensures *adequacy* and *equity* in Maryland public schools by linking resources to the needs of students and distributing State education aid inverse to local wealth.

As a result of this landmark legislation, Maryland embraced a standards-based approach to public school financing based on the premise that when students have access to rigorous curriculum, highly qualified teachers, and programs that employ proven strategies and methods for student learning, all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, or socioeconomic background, can achieve. Under this approach, and consistent with the federal *No Child Left Behind Act*, the State established benchmark academic content and student achievement standards, ensures that schools and students have sufficient resources to meet those standards, and holds schools and school systems accountable for student performance.

### **Five-Year Master Plans Required**

The *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act* provides a powerful framework for the State's 24 school systems to create a vision of public education that ensures the acceleration of achievement for all students. Local school systems are required to develop comprehensive master plans that include goals and strategies to promote academic excellence among all students and to eliminate performance gaps that persist based on students' race, ethnicity, socioeconomic circumstances, disability, and native language. Local school systems are given the flexibility to direct resources to the specific needs of students in their system with the presumption that all State, local and federal education resources will be integrated and coordinated to reach the overarching goals of improving student learning and ensuring that all students receive an adequate education. Each local school system master plan must align the county board's budget with the goals, objectives and strategies for improving student achievement.

### **Additional Accountability Measures Added in the 2004 Session**

The unrestricted nature of increased financial support to local school systems creates the need for unique accountability measures. In addition to the academic accountability standards, the State must ensure that school systems have the mechanisms in place to guarantee that funds are being spent appropriately. State education aid is among the fastest growing components of the State general fund budget, increasing from 26% of expenditures in FY 2002 to 33% in FY 2005. By FY 2008, State education aid is expected to account for 36% of general fund expenditures.

*The Education Fiscal Accountability and Oversight Act of 2004* requires local school systems to provide biannual fiscal reports to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and the county government. The Act prohibits local school systems from carrying a deficit, provides specific remedial actions for systems that carry a deficit, affirms recourse should a school system not comply with the Act, and provides for an audit of each local school system by the Office of Legislative Audits. Additionally, the Office of Legislative Audits is required to conduct a centralized audit of all local school systems' master plans and report the findings to the Joint Audit Committee.

In addition, the State Superintendent must review how each county's budget aligns with the master plan and any updates to it. The State Superintendent must report the findings of this review to the Governor, the General Assembly, the county governing body, and the county board of education annually. This report is the first to be prepared under the requirements of this section.

## **Development and Review of Master Plans and Annual Updates**

The Maryland State Department of Education formed a Bridge to Excellence Master Plan Workgroup, comprised of experienced educators and representatives from stakeholder groups across the State as part of a collaborative process to provide resources, guidance, and review criteria to assist local school systems in developing the five-year master plans required under the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act*. As part of this process, a master plan peer review process was developed, creating peer review panels consisting of local school system central office administrators, principals, classroom teachers, parents, educators, experts on educational innovation, advocates, and State and local policy makers.

The peer review panels evaluated the master plans, identified areas needing further clarification and conducted a site visit which, collectively, provided a clear understanding of each local school system's plan to improve the academic achievement of all students. MSDE staff conducted technical reviews of specific federal and restricted programs and served as facilitators to the peer review panels. In 2003, the State Board approved five-year comprehensive master plans for 23 local school systems.

The Bridge to Excellence Master Plan is reviewed at least annually and revised as needed, with an annual update submitted to MSDE. As part of the annual review, local planning teams evaluate the implementation of goals, objectives, and strategies to determine their effect on student performance and classroom practices. Because school systems integrated into their master plans programs and performance goals under the *No Child Left Behind Act*, school systems must review factors that are crucial to continuous and improved student performance. These factors include qualified teachers, high quality and job-embedded professional development, school safety, and parental involvement. In preparing the master plan update, school systems must conduct a reflective analysis of their student assessment data to determine the effectiveness of the strategies outlined in the master plans.

As part of the annual master plan update, local school systems must include a budget narrative that explains how the budgeted revenues will be used to support the goals, objectives, and strategies detailed in the five-year master plan, and any revisions to the initial plan. MSDE's guidance required that overall budgetary changes be broken into five components – mandatory increases, new initiatives, additional positions, revised strategies and redirected or reduced funding.

Local school systems submitted annual updates on August 15, 2004. MSDE staff conducted technical reviews of federal and restricted program elements, and the updates were reviewed and evaluated by panels of MSDE and local school system staff for overall approval recommendations. Each system had the opportunity to meet with the review panel to present and discuss the update. During the month of September, systems were given the opportunity to make revisions to their updates based on the technical reviews and panel comments. By October 1, each system was required to submit supplemental budgetary data to reflect actual revenues and expenditures from the prior year (fiscal 2004)<sup>1</sup>.

The annual updates, including the budget component, were scrutinized through this review process. The State Superintendent made recommendations to the State Board, and twenty-one school systems received approval of their annual update at the October State Board meeting. Two systems were required to submit additional, detailed information, and those plans were approved at the December State Board meeting.<sup>2</sup>

## **Budget Review of 2004 Master Plan Updates**

MSDE has completed a review of the annual master plan updates submitted by local school systems and approved by the State Board of Education. A summary of each school system's master plan update budget can be found in Attachment A. MSDE guidance provided the general format of the budget narrative, including specifying the five categories to allocate the incremental change in spending from fiscal 2004 to fiscal 2005 – mandatory increases, new positions, new initiatives, revised strategies, and redirected/ reduced funding. Local school systems differed in the level of specificity of the itemization, the precision of the connection to master plan strategies, the amount of explanatory discussion, and to some extent, the classification of items into the various categories. While the review panels and MSDE technical reviewers sought clarifying information as needed, wide variation remains. This variation was not deemed sufficient to prevent the approval of the master plan updates, but these factors make statewide analysis somewhat difficult.

The individual reports in Attachment A depict the budget narrative as presented by the local school system and summarized by MSDE. While these summaries are

---

<sup>1</sup> As of this writing, Prince George's County Public Schools have submitted unaudited prior year figures.

<sup>2</sup> In February 2004, the State Board of Education requested Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS) submit a final Master Plan for review and approval by August 16, 2004. The State Board of Education approved BCPSS's Master Plan on October 27, 2004. Because the 2004 update is incorporated as part of the Master Plan, BCPSS is not included in the number of annual updates approved by the State Board of Education, but its information is included in the following section of this report.

accurate, MSDE would encourage interested parties to read the full text of each system's master plan update and budget narrative for a complete understanding of the use of additional funds in the current year and the alignment of those expenditures with the goals, objectives, and strategies of the master plan.

### **Overall Spending by Local School Systems Grows by \$505 Million**

The budget narrative provided by each system provides a summary of the overall growth in their budgets from fiscal 2004 to 2005. In all, school system budgets statewide have increased by \$505.4 million to \$8.125 billion from all sources. State aid to education increased by an average of 8.2%, with Prince George's County receiving the highest percentage increase at 13.6%, and Kent County's aid declining by 1.0%. Local education funding increased an average of 4.1%, with Howard County receiving the highest percentage increase at 7.8%. Federal education funding increased an average of 4.4% in Maryland from fiscal 2004 to 2005.

### **Certain Areas of Increased Expenditure are Common to Many Systems**

Of the overall increase of \$505.4 million, \$274.8 million (54.4%) is being spent on salary and benefit increases for the existing staff complement. Fifteen systems<sup>3</sup> specifically identified increases in employee health insurance expenses totaling \$85 million, although it is likely that others are also experiencing rising costs in this area. Three systems<sup>4</sup> specifically reported allocating additional funds totaling \$55.8 million for improvements to the salary scale in the current year to enhance their competitive posture for teacher recruitment and retention.

Adding teaching and school-based positions to accommodate increasing enrollment is another common theme among the systems. Twelve systems<sup>5</sup> specifically report expenditures of \$39.4 million related to maintaining preferred class sizes in light of increasing enrollment. This includes situations where systems are opening new schools. Five systems<sup>6</sup> report staffing additions totaling \$15.2 million expressly to reduce class size as part of initiative to improve student achievement.

The continued implementation of full-day kindergarten and expansion of pre-kindergarten for at risk students is also pervasive throughout the budget discussions. Fifteen systems<sup>7</sup> specifically reported additional expenses associated with increasing the reach of full-day kindergarten; four systems<sup>8</sup> specifically addressed pre-kindergarten expansion programs. Statewide, the spending on full-day kindergarten and pre-kindergarten increased \$8.9 million and \$8.8 million, respectively.

---

<sup>3</sup> Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Dorchester, Harford, Howard, Kent, Montgomery, Prince George's, St. Mary's, Somerset, Washington, and Wicomico

<sup>4</sup> Baltimore, Caroline, and Prince George's

<sup>5</sup> Baltimore, Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, Washington, and Wicomico

<sup>6</sup> Anne Arundel, Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's, and Worcester

<sup>7</sup> Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Cecil, Charles, Dorchester, Frederick, Harford, Howard, Kent, Montgomery, St. Mary's, Somerset, Washington, Wicomico, and Worcester

<sup>8</sup> Allegany, Anne Arundel, Prince George's, and Washington



Systems reported a variety of “cost of doing business” increases, including items such as utility costs and escalations in maintenance contracts. Increased costs for nonpublic special education tuition totaling \$15.5 million were specifically reported by fourteen systems<sup>9</sup>. Eleven systems<sup>10</sup> cited increased transportation costs totaling \$8.9 million.

### **A Sampling of Other Initiatives**

Collectively, school systems allocated an additional \$224.5 million of statewide revenue growth to a variety of initiatives consistent with their master plans. The rich and varied array of priorities cannot be adequately described in this report, and this presentation is by no means exhaustive. Again, the reader is directed to the individual master plan updates.

- Twelve systems reported additional spending of \$8.9 million on new textbooks for a wide variety of instructional reasons, such as bringing consistency throughout the system, aligning to the Voluntary State Curriculum, and adopting resources consistent with the Reading First program.
- A variety of initiatives related to special education were reported by thirteen systems. These ranged from expanding the inclusion opportunities for kindergarten students to increasing the number of instructional aides to providing staff development in differentiated instruction.
- Improvements in the use of technology are being made in eleven systems, totaling \$15.0 million, to expand the reach of computers in the classroom and media centers, to analyze student achievement to better target teaching strategies, and to enhance central office and financial operations.
- Seven systems cite additional funding of \$1.1 million for arts and gifted and talented programs. These range from additional staffing for an International Baccalaureate program to the procurement of more musical instruments for economically disadvantaged students.
- Seven local school systems specifically identified additional resources totaling \$2.2 million directed to high school initiatives, such as Career Clusters, small learning communities, and a freshman seminar for students and their parent or guardian.

### **Systems Redirected Funding from Other Priorities**

---

<sup>9</sup> Allegany, Baltimore City, Baltimore, Calvert, Caroline, Carroll, Charles, Dorchester, Harford, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George’s, Washington, and Worcester

<sup>10</sup> Allegany, Calvert, Caroline, Charles, Garrett, Harford, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George’s, Washington, and Wicomico

Despite the overall growth in appropriations to school system budgets, sixteen school systems<sup>11</sup> found it necessary to redirect funding to ensure the implementation of the goals, objectives and strategies of their comprehensive master plan. With the continued phase-in of the *Bridge to Excellence in Public Schools Act*, previously restricted grant funds are now unrestricted allowing school systems to redirect these funds. Statewide, school systems made reductions totaling \$146.4 million in order to fund other initiatives and mandatory expenditures within their budgets.

### **Programmatic Commendations from Review Panels**

Local school systems were commended by peer review teams for their diligence in pursuing goals, implementation of unique strategies, and development of research-based programs all geared at ensuring improved academic achievement of all Maryland's students. Highlights of these commendations include: vertical team planning, implementing data-driven decisions, on-line grade book with parent access, developing a student data warehouse, extended learning opportunities for at-risk youth, formative and summative assessments, and instituting pilot programs prior to full implementation. Commendations from the panels can be found on each system's summary page in Attachment A.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

The Maryland State Department of Education has reviewed both the educational and budgetary components of master plan updates for 23 local school systems. The State Board of Education has approved the master plan updates for these school systems as well as the master plan for the Baltimore City Public Schools. The review and approval process has concluded that school system budgets support the goals, objectives, and strategies of the master plans and that the master plans, in turn, will result in improved student achievement.

The preparation, review, revision, and implementation of master plans and annual updates are evolving practices for both the Maryland State Department of Education and local school systems. The Bridge to Excellence Master Plan Workgroup is reconvening in January 2005 to consider improvements to the guidance provided by MSDE and to the overall process. These improvements will be in place for the submission of the 2005 annual updates.

---

<sup>11</sup> Allegany, Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore, Caroline, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Kent, Montgomery, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Washington, and Wicomico

<b><u>Allegany County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$83,906
	Fiscal 2005	\$89,102
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$5,196</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>3,785</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	2,591
	Increased costs of special education	246
	Increased costs of nonpublic placements	443
	Pre-kindergarten programs	67
	Add 25 classified instructional positions to replace 25 temporary positions	368
	Utilities	228
	Transportation	128
	Other increases/decreases	(286)
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>2,253</b>
	One-time funding for Board share of A/E for new high school, continue middle school after school program, and computer replacement	1,308
	One-time funding for replacement of textbooks and instructional materials to align curriculum and allocations for schools for instructional materials and supplies	720
	Add Evening High program, one additional pre-kindergarten program, and expand one current pre-kindergarten program to full-day	211
	Extend positions of Testing and Gifted/Talented coordinators to 12 month	14
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>245</b>
	Secondary teaching positions to address staffing needs (3)	138
	Case management to continue no longer funded grant positions	40
	Assistant supervisor for maintenance and school construction	67
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(1,087)</b>
	FY 2004 one-time instructional purchases not funded in FY 2005	(400)
	Restricted Grant funds	(687)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>5,196</b>
Data reflects information provided subsequent to approved master plan update.		

<b>Allegany County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	2
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Allegany County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing the enhancements suggested by the 2003 Peer Review Panel and taking the additional step of doing a self-assessment in order to make improvements in the Master Plan.</li> <li>Implementing a series of strategies to maintain and enhance improved student achievement in schools previously identified for school improvement that have made adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Anne Arundel County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$609,237
	Fiscal 2005	\$640,827
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$31,590</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>33,987</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	23,350
	Health insurance	10,637
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>4,969</b>
	Teachers (48) for high school class size reduction	2,233
	Teachers (29.5) and assistants (12.5) for full-day kindergarten	1,725
	Teachers (12) and assistants (6) for full-day pre-kindergarten	728
	Coordinators (2) and teachers (2) for International Baccalaureate	283
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(7,367)</b>
	Pupil personnel workers (12)	(1,100)
	Contractual maintenance	(900)
	Supplies, equipment, labor	(1,500)
	Savings from hiring freeze	(867)
	State non-public grant	(3,000)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>31,590</b>

<b>Anne Arundel County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	11
	<b>Year 2</b>	2
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	1
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Anne Arundel County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishing an instructional focus to move all students forward through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ coordination of a standardized curriculum aligned with the Voluntary State Curriculum;</li> <li>➤ alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment;</li> <li>➤ updated charters for program implementation; and</li> <li>➤ a comprehensive professional development plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Designing a reading intervention continuum that provides grade appropriate materials and interventions matched to the needs of students.</li> <li>Employing data driven student and school improvement policies.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Baltimore City</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$884,619
	Fiscal 2005	\$917,606
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$32,987</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>42,440</b>
	Deficit reduction	35,000
	Debt service increase	7,440
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>40,493</b>
	Contingency reserve	10,000
	High school and middle school reform	7,331
	State mandated restructuring	5,715
	Staffing materials for low performing schools	5,284
	Nonpublic placement expenses	4,000
	K-8 programs	3,810
	Textbooks	3,353
	Edison contract	1,000
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(49,050)</b>
	Increase in class size	(18,085)
	Central office budgeted positions	(11,000)
	Limited summer school	(9,638)
	Academic coach positions	(7,527)
	Equipment and contracted services	(2,800)
<b>Other</b>		<b>(896)</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>32,987</b>

<b>Baltimore City - School Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?	✓	
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	17
	<b>Year 2</b>	4
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	3
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	36
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	31
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Baltimore City Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross-walking prior review panel recommendations into the revised Master Plan II. It is evident that BCPSS staff gave serious consideration to the recommendations.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a detailed Executive Summary outlining the evolution of the Master Plan II and BCPSS has used the planning process to develop a comprehensive document that integrates its reform and improvement initiatives.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrating ESEA performance goals into Master Plan II and addressing strategies in a comprehensive manner.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies a variety of challenges on which the system needs to work. Throughout the plan, BCPSS thoroughly addressed the needs of subgroups through the identification and implementation of research-based strategies targeted to the needs of subpopulations.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including special education staff in curriculum development activities.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting the new teachers' summer institute over four weeks during the summer of 2004.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a comprehensive strategic recruitment plan to increase the number of quality teachers who remain in the system.</li> </ul>		



<b><u>Baltimore County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$944,020
	Fiscal 2005	\$996,322
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$52,302</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>31,205</b>
	Health insurance	14,980
	Step increases for all employees	9,844
	Utility costs increases	3,110
	Nonpublic placements	1,965
	Other mandatory	1,306
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>27,646</b>
	Restructured compensation scales	20,710
	Science/math teachers for targeted elementary schools	1,595
	Secondary transition center	1,525
	Expand kindergarten special education inclusion (16 schools)	1,324
	Consistent grade 6 reading materials	1,067
	Expand to full-day kindergarten (10 schools)	741
	5th grade Outdoor Science program	149
	Other new initiatives	535
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>3,498</b>
	Special education enrollment growth	1,783
	Enrollment growth	1,015
	Pupil personnel workers	345
	Other staff	355
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(9,415)</b>
	State restricted grants	(3,904)
	Academic enrichment	(2,518)
	Central textbooks account	(1,067)
	Other redirects	(1,926)
<b>Other</b>		<b>(632)</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>52,302</b>

<b>Baltimore County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	18
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	1
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Baltimore County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing a student data warehouse system that monitors student programs in order to adjust instructional programs to the needs of individual students.</li> <li>Establishing pre-kindergarten programs in 80 of the 103 elementary schools.</li> <li>Establishing full-day kindergarten programs in 74 of the 103 elementary schools.</li> <li>Carrying out annual summer academies for principals in reading and math to make sure that they have the skills to supervise and be effective instructional leaders.</li> <li>Implementing a superintendent's retreat for all principals at the close of the school year.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Calvert County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$142,088
	Fiscal 2005	\$151,907
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$9,819</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>6,200</b>
	Negotiated salaries and benefits	3,700
	Enrollment growth (39.5 positions)	1,300
	Student transportation costs	700
	Special education tuitions	200
	Operating, maintenance, and capital outlay costs	300
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>3,000</b>
	Opening new Huntingtown High School (45.5 positions)	2,900
	Alternative school program	100
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>300</b>
	Information technology for No Child Left Behind	300
<b>Other</b>		<b>319</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>9,819</b>

<b>Calvert County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Calvert County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding the use of performance data at classroom, building, and system levels.</li> <li>Expanding focus on Early Intervention.</li> <li>Developing and integrating strategies to improve reading achievement in middle school.</li> <li>Increasing emphasis on building math skills at the elementary, middle and high school levels.</li> <li>Initiating a ninth grade academy to remediate both math and reading deficiencies.</li> <li>Fostering greater articulation between elementary, middle and high school.</li> <li>Emphasizing co-teaching and the use of student learning specialists in an effort to raise test scores of students with disabilities.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishing a team structure across grade levels.</li> <li>Interweaving school improvement with the goals and strategies of the Master Plan.</li> <li>Collaborating across schools, communities and local agencies to involve parents and families.</li> <li>Engaging teachers in the change processes.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Caroline County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$42,609
	Fiscal 2005	\$42,702
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$93</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>1,252</b>
	Step increase and benefit enhancements	842
	Transportation	104
	Electricity	96
	Nonpublic placement tuition	75
	Other mandatory	135
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>1,184</b>
	Salary and benefit enhancements	1,060
	Human resources manager	64
	Pupil services teacher specialist	60
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(2,343)</b>
	Increase in restricted federal funds	258
	Redirected grant funds	875
	Staff reductions	(366)
	Summer school transportation	(40)
	Projected E-Rate savings	(39)
	Decrease in restricted State funds	(895)
	Prior year revenue not available in FY 05	(1,998)
	Other reductions	(138)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>93</b>

<b>Caroline County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	1
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Caroline County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a Middle School Enrichment and Intervention Manual that lists the procedures for identifying students for enrichment and intervention programs in language arts and math, describes available programs, and guides instruction in enrichment and intervention classrooms.</li> <li>• Working to improve collaborative relationships with the local government.</li> <li>• Training staff in the use of the Voluntary State Curriculum.</li> <li>• Improving the use of student performance data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ developing a new student information system;</li> <li>➤ expanding focus on data analysis; and,</li> <li>➤ building understanding and discussion of student performance based on data analysis.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<b><u>Carroll County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$224,600
	Fiscal 2005	\$243,382
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$18,782</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>15,573</b>
	Salary increases	7,937
	Employee fringe benefits	3,593
	Instructional (42.5) and other (14.1) staff for enrollment growth	2,099
	Utilities	561
	Positions (4.5) and materials for new schools	320
	Nonpublic placements	150
	Other mandatory	913
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>2,092</b>
	Replacement cycle for computers	1,200
	Additional work day for teachers	623
	Tuition reimbursement	197
	Flexible student support services	72
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>1,117</b>
	High school reading specialist (8)	445
	Math resource teachers (4)	304
	English as a second language (2)	91
	Other staff (9)	277
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>18,782</b>

<b>Carroll County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Carroll County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasizing that the instructional activities underway are focused on the needs of each individual student.</li> <li>• Diagnosing student needs during the first week of kindergarten.</li> <li>• Utilizing programs like Early Success for Kindergarten through primary grades; Soar to Success for grades 4 and up, and a comprehensive K through 12 reading program to produce strong student achievement.</li> </ul>		



<b><u>Cecil County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$126,213
	Fiscal 2005	\$134,339
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$8,126</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>7,000</b>
	Negotiated salary increases	4,900
	Health insurance and benefits	1,700
	Utilities and contracted services	400
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>181</b>
	Increased staff development	80
	Instructional and administrative equipment	64
	Full-day kindergarten	25
	Career cluster courses	12
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>2,861</b>
	Enrollment growth and maintenance of class size (20)	1,100
	Teachers (17) for career clusters and high school requirements	935
	Teachers (4.5) and assistants (4.5) for full-day kindergarten	350
	Technology support (3)	180
	Other staffing (4.5)	296
<b>Revised Strategies</b>		<b>130</b>
	Career cluster teacher (1)	65
	Academic support for career technology education	65
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(2,102)</b>
	Reductions in Title I and IID	(35)
	Reductions in grants funds	(2,067)
<b>Other</b>		<b>56</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>8,126</b>

<b>Cecil County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	2
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Cecil County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiating a student achievement database called "Merlin" that is available to all secondary school administrators enabling them to monitor individual student progress.</li> <li>Implementing the second phase of their electronic grade book system in the second semester that will permit secondary school parents to monitor their child's grades online.</li> <li>Continuing the instructional focus on individual student achievement.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Charles County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$195,228
	Fiscal 2005	\$213,550
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$18,322</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>14,776</b>
	Negotiated step increases, COLA, related fringe benefits	9,816
	Transportation	2,132
	Special education (nonpublic)	1,258
	Technology plan loan payments	1,230
	Utilities	300
	Other mandatory	40
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>1,281</b>
	Materials of instruction	354
	Equipment	180
	Full-day kindergarten	143
	Other (contracted services, staff development, restricted grants)	604
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>4,282</b>
	Teachers for enrollment growth	1,658
	Full-day kindergarten	691
	Pupil personnel workers in middle schools	219
	Elementary instructional leadership teams	175
	Special education	509
	Early childhood (Even Start)	98
	Other staffing	932
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(2,079)</b>
	Restricted State grants	(1,340)
	General operating budget	(570)
	Restricted federal and local grants	(169)
<b>Other</b>		<b>62</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>18,322</b>

<b>Charles County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Charles County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing strategies to boost student achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ extending two school days a week for at-risk students, with transportation, at all schools.</li> <li>➤ aligning the school improvement planning process and Master Plan with the Voluntary State Curriculum.</li> <li>➤ providing embedded staff development support for teachers with Instructional Leadership Teams.</li> <li>➤ assessing students entering system to determine individual student needs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Developing a "Data Warehouse" that links all available longitudinal student data and indicates appropriate interventions tailored to each student's individual weaknesses; providing staff development for teachers and principals to learn how to use the data and see the benefits.</li> <li>Building a real partnership between the superintendent of schools and county commissioners.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Dorchester County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$40,005
	Fiscal 2005	\$41,972
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$1,967</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>1,509</b>
	Health insurance	641
	2% salary increase	603
	Electricity and fuel oil	91
	Special education teacher (1) and assistants (2)	89
	Nonpublic placements	35
	Other mandatory	50
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>395</b>
	full-day kindergarten in all schools	370
	Stipends for curriculum development	25
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>26</b>
	Custodian (1)	26
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(76)</b>
	General fund support for positions and materials previously grant-funded	398
	Position reductions (9.5)	(474)
<b>Other</b>		<b>113</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>1,967</b>

<b>Dorchester County School System Improvement</b>		
<b>Has the school system been identified for:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	4
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Dorchester County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating an Office of School Improvement directly under the supervision of the superintendent that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ provides technical support for schools in school improvement;</li> <li>➤ monitors school improvement plans;</li> <li>➤ delivers professional development; and,</li> <li>➤ implements a structured plan for monitoring instructional interventions in math and reading for all students performing below grade level.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementing the use of Personal Educational Plan (PEP) notebooks for all students below grade level in reading or math.</li> <li>Aligning all school improvement plans with the Master Plan in terms of initiatives, strategies, professional development and budget.</li> <li>Establishing a partnership with Salisbury University to design and deliver high-quality professional development based on teacher needs.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Frederick County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$311,031
	Fiscal 2005	\$328,383
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$17,352</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>17,926</b>
	Step increases and 2% COLA	8,600
	Enrollment growth and opening of 2 new schools (36.8 positions)	2,795
	Expand full-day kindergarten (7 schools)	738
	Continuation of effort (inc. health insurance, instructional equipment, bus replacement, and other items)	5,793
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>3,425</b>
	Differentiated staffing (21.5)	1,087
	Restore class size (31)	906
	Judy Center and Even Start (1.5)	105
	Elementary instructional director (1)	110
	Special education teachers (4)	189
	Speech and vision specialists (3)	160
	School-within-a-school (4)	169
	Human resources and technology staff (5)	340
	Other staffing (16)	359
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(4,414)</b>
	One-time costs from FY 04 (inc. health insurance fund, start-up costs for new high school, textbook replacement, and equipment purchases)	(3,466)
	Title I reduction	(948)
<b>Other</b>		<b>415</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>17,352</b>

<b>Frederick County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	3
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	1
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Frederick County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing extended learning opportunities and extended year.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding Excel schools to target enhancements that may prevent schools from moving toward identification as schools in need of improvement.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing a clear picture of the capital budget.</li> </ul>		



<b><u>Garrett County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$40,490
	Fiscal 2005	\$42,123
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$1,633</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>1,174</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	873
	Transportation	218
	Operating Costs	83
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>58</b>
	Evening scheduling for high school students	7
	Freshman seminar	13
	Computer purchases	21
	Special education staff development	14
	Special education advisory committee	3
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>356</b>
	Diagnostic Prescriptive teacher	67
	Special education teacher	43
	Case manager	43
	Machine tool teacher	49
	Family Support worker	30
	Media/Computer technician	43
	Coordinator of Transportation/ Administrative Services	82
<b>Revised Strategies</b>		<b>45</b>
	Intervention/acceleration program at elementary level	45
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>1,633</b>

<b>Garrett County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Garrett County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding the Instructional Consultation Team strategy from two elementary schools to four elementary schools and one more middle school.</li> <li>Providing staff development on Ruby Payne's framework for understanding the effects of poverty on students.</li> <li>Using effective strategies to bring about improvements in performance, including formative assessments and use of technology to monitor students' progress.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Harford County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$298,175
	Fiscal 2005	\$316,599
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$18,424</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>16,512</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	6,249
	Health Insurance	5,055
	Termination payment of accumulated leave	300
	Full-day kindergarten - 13 positions and furniture and supplies	718
	Salary funding for inclusion helpers	448
	Increased transportation costs	528
	Increased nonpublic placement costs	967
	Increased utilities and maintenance costs	1,796
	OTIS Comprehensive disaster recovery plan	48
	Student activities and sports stipends	301
	Software programming services	102
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>175</b>
	Aberdeen High School library books and supplies	100
	North Harford High School construction capital outlay	75
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>290</b>
	Assistant Principal	70
	Water treatment technician (.5)	20
	New special education positions	200
<b>Other</b>		<b>1,447</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>18,424</b>

<b>Harford County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	5
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Harford County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing cost effective practice of piloting programs before scaling up for broad-based program implementation.</li> <li>Deploying strategic resources to schools identified as needing targeted assistance.</li> <li>Employing a diverse set of strategies to ensure student success, including parent involvement, math and reading interventions, curriculum alignment, and staff professional development programs.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Howard County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$443,270
	Fiscal 2005	\$483,104
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$39,834</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>32,555</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	28,955
	Health insurance	2,900
	Transportation	700
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>1,330</b>
	Full-day kindergarten - implement in 7 additional schools	1,000
	Enterprise resource planning system	330
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>2,500</b>
	Staff to accommodate enrollment growth (43)	1,539
	LEP, special education staff and other staff	961
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>1,200</b>
	Increase in local share of nonpublic placements	1,200
<b>Other</b>		<b>2,249</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>39,834</b>

<b>Howard County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	1
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Howard County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting a special education needs assessment and concluding that the school system needed to provide additional training on developing IEPs.</li> <li>• Recognizing that additional training needs to occur earlier in the year.</li> <li>• Using a governance approach that focuses on the SMART approach to developing objectives.</li> <li>• Developing and implementing the Enterprise Resource System to replace multiple legacy systems (e.g., human resources, financial data reporting, payroll, transportation, food services).</li> <li>• Identifying a correlation between results on local assessments and MSA, indicating the predictive nature of the local assessments that are clearly aligned to the MSA.</li> <li>• Using five languages for all major printing of school system publications.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Kent County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$23,768
	Fiscal 2005	\$24,240
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$472</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>396</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	121
	Health insurance	243
	Utilities	32
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>141</b>
	Special Education Reading teacher (federal funds)	56
	Full-day kindergarten teacher	72
	Contract nurses	13
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(65)</b>
	Other insurance requirements	16
	Reduction - staff positions	(54)
	Reduction - bus contracts	(27)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>472</b>
Data reflects information provided subsequent to approved master plan update.		

<b>Kent County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	1
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Kent County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rewriting their Master Plan in order to provide all current strategies and initiatives in a single reference document.</li> <li>Maintaining instructional initiatives while coping with limited resources.</li> <li>Developing staffing plans to improve high school students' reading scores.</li> </ul>		



<b>Montgomery County</b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$1,451,085
	Fiscal 2005	\$1,560,174
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$109,089</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>101,626</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	49,106
	Health insurance	30,988
	Nonpublic tuition rate changes	1,121
	Enrollment growth and new schools (225.7 FTE)	13,619
	Utilities, energy tax	2,714
	Transportation	2,332
	Contractual maintenance for technology systems	818
	Inflation for textbooks and instructional materials	736
	Facilities rental, maintenance and building services	193
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>9,553</b>
	Full-day kindergarten - 17 schools (29 FTE)	1,612
	Textbooks for new curriculum	420
	Downcounty Consortium	200
	Foundations program (2 FTE)	167
	Staff development (13 FTE)	1,766
	Special Education Staffing plan (11.5 FTE)	625
	Formative assessments	291
	New grading and reporting system	246
	Technology, transportation and maintenance (8 FTE)	736
	College Institute	150
	Title I - reduce class size, increase materials and position allocations (29.3 FTE)	1,983
	Title III - increases for ESOL summer school, interpretation and translation services	173
	Perkins Vocational Education - instructional equipment	101
	IDEA - additional pre-kindergarten teachers, interpreters, training and materials	1,085
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(4,450)</b>
	Staff development projects (13 FTE)	(915)
	Instructional support positions (74.4 FTE)	(1,915)
	Central office support - curriculum and instructional programs (1.5 FTE)	(733)
	Telecommunications and technology	(225)
	Central office support - financial services	(85)
	School replacement furniture	(128)
	Alternative programs (.8 FTE)	(107)
	Human resources support	(94)
	Residency compliance and instructional programs (6 FTE)	(248)
<b>Other</b>		<b>2,360</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>109,089</b>

<b>Montgomery County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	12
	<b>Year 2</b>	6
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	1
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Montgomery County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a comprehensive approach to strategic planning as presented in the “Call to Action” plan that makes student outcomes the guiding principle of its Master Plan and integrates community interests, educational policy programs, budget, and technology.</li> <li>• Establishing and employing a continuous improvement policy for all school system initiatives affecting student performance outcomes.</li> <li>• Employing student data effectively to target under-performing students, student groups, and schools.</li> <li>• Using technology to support all school system activities and initiatives including the relating of budget allocations to program strategies.</li> <li>• Engaging broad-based stakeholder groups to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ strengthen the strategic plan; and,</li> <li>➤ provide county government decision makers with sufficient information to ensure financial support for strategic planning initiatives.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<b><u>Prince George's County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$1,170,235
	Fiscal 2005	\$1,271,649
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$101,414</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>51,800</b>
	Negotiated salary increases and related fringe benefits	13,536
	Employee benefits	9,589
	Risk Management, including deficit reduction	11,282
	Utilities, internal services and other essential support	2,350
	Enrollment increases (171.5 FTE)	15,043
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>72,666</b>
	Class size reduction	9,863
	Full-day pre-kindergarten	7,770
	Extended learning opportunities	7,454
	Update textbooks and enhance library media services	5,629
	Supporting services for ELL, special education and students with exceptional abilities	8,034
	Alternative middle and high schools	4,000
	Other curriculum and instructional expenditures	5,385
	Strategic planning and school support (5 FTE)	1,986
	Diagnostic and Prescriptive Learning/Testing	4,859
	School Security (22 FTE)	593
	Technology improvements (3 FTE)	10,806
	Administrative and Management Support	6,287
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(57,052)</b>
	Deficit reserve	(23,674)
	Base budget reductions including staff development, school improvement and equipment converted to lease purchase.	(9,747)
	Other reductions including frozen vacancies (200 FTE)	(23,630)
<b>Other</b>		<b>34,000</b>
	Compensation improvements	
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>101,414</b>

<b>Prince George's County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	54
	<b>Year 2</b>	3
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	5
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	4
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	7
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Prince George's County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishing a Teacher Advisory Committee, consisting of one teacher from each school, which gives direct feedback to the Chief Executive Officer on a regular basis about problems in the classroom and practical innovations that teachers can use to improve student performance.</li> <li>Establishing Faculty Support Teams to provide customized assistance to schools.</li> <li>Implementing the Student Information Management System (SIMS) and training teachers and principals in the use of student data.</li> <li>Aligning benchmark assessments, instructional practice, and materials with the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).</li> <li>Aligning special education materials with the VSC.</li> <li>Restructuring the English Language Learners (ELL) program so that the scheduling of ELL services does not conflict with core reading instruction.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Queen Anne's County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$60,707
	Fiscal 2005	\$63,067
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$2,360</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>2,780</b>
	Negotiated salary and benefits	2,287
	Operational costs	493
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>465</b>
	New elementary school opening	410
	High school Spanish	40
	Part-time sign language interpreter	15
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(885)</b>
	Instructional facilitators	(114)
	Clerical staff	(51)
	Summer school	(146)
	Materials of instruction/textbooks	(203)
	Restructure alternative program	(69)
	Instructional assistants	(39)
	Substitutes	(25)
	Mentor program	(42)
	Equipment (computer and replacement)	(55)
	Other support staff	(105)
	Other reductions	(36)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>2,360</b>

<b>Queen Anne's County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Queen Anne's County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing school staff with specific days on which student data will be examined and evaluated for individual student instructional modifications and program modifications.</li> <li>• Asking teachers to keep a reflection journal on student performance in which they will reflect on the data of each student and the progress of the students overall.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>St. Mary's County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$122,137
	Fiscal 2005	\$131,250
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$9,113</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>6,604</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	3,723
	Insurance benefits	2,143
	Contractual obligations	10
	Transportation	458
	Utilities	270
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>190</b>
	Full-day kindergarten	10
	Small learning communities	167
	Increase tuition assistance	13
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>1,124</b>
	Teachers (3) and paraeducators (6) to continue full-day kindergarten initiative	195
	Additional staff (net 11) in special education program	259
	Additional high school (2) and middle school (3) math teachers	192
	Other staffing changes	478
<b>Revised Strategies</b>		<b>353</b>
	Reading - reallocation of annual textbook budget	228
	11-month school year covered by Title I grant	125
<b>Other</b>		<b>842</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>9,113</b>

<b>St. Mary's County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	2
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends St. Mary's County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing an innovative "Eleven Month School" program, extending the school year at the beginning of the year to provide a "jump start" for at-risk students at Title I schools that have not met AYP. The program incorporates small class sizes, incentives for experienced teachers, assistance for new teachers, and an Olympic theme to create a productive and rewarding educational experience.</li> <li>Aligning the budget to goals, strategies and activities in the Master Plan.</li> <li>Aligning the school improvement planning process and the Master Plan with the Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC).</li> <li>Providing Technical Assistance Teams to assist schools.</li> <li>Creating a new position at the central office to be in charge of strategic planning and school improvement.</li> </ul>		



<b>Somerset County</b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$26,967
	Fiscal 2005	\$28,433
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$1,466</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>1,040</b>
	Salary and benefit increases	490
	Insurance increases	65
	Health insurance premium increases	412
	Bus contracts	60
	Maintenance and support contracts	13
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>161</b>
	New elementary textbook series	111
	Computer based assessment and intervention	50
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>623</b>
	Student information analyst	41
	Computer repair/technology teacher	40
	Disciplinarians/Dean of Students (3 FTE)	188
	Kindergarten teachers and assistants (2)	93
	Academic support instructor	34
	Physical education assistant	16
	Alternative to suspension monitor	22
	ELL teacher	40
	Gifted and talented coordinator/career counselor	68
	Special education assistants (2)	30
	IEP Assistant (part-time, contractual)	14
	PC technician	30
	Custodian (.5 FTE)	8
<b>Continued Strategies</b>		<b>264</b>
	Science consumable kits	21
	Replace science and music furniture	20
	Computer equipment	125
	Lease copiers for schools	30
	Increase staff development stipends, consultants for reading and math intervention	27
	Materials and equipment for two new kindergarten rooms	26
	Staff development for student information system	15
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(642)</b>
	Eliminated 3 VP for Instructionally driven Disciplinarians and Dean of Students	(195)
	Savings through retirees	(269)
	Decrease in plant operation - closed Woodson Middle	(135)
	Reduced material allotments for one year to pay for new reading textbooks	(18)
	Reduced secondary textbook allocation to pay for new reading text	(25)
<b>Other</b>		<b>20</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>1,466</b>

<b>Somerset County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?	✓	
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Somerset County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiating and implementing a school system grade reorganization that includes school closure and consolidation to better utilize existing resources.</li> <li>• Implementing individual learning plans (ILPs) for all 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade students by October 1, 2004. The ILP's will be used throughout the school year as discussion points in team meetings. All student ILPs will be reviewed and updated by the full team multiple times throughout the year.</li> </ul>		

<b><u>Talbot County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$36,847
	Fiscal 2005	\$38,029
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$1,183</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>1,382</b>
	Salary and fringe benefits	824
	Health insurance	330
	Plant operation	96
	Supplemental educational services for Title I students	125
	Community Service Grant	7
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(199)</b>
	One-time purchase of textbooks and instructional supplies in FY 04	(52)
	Student personnel - reduction of .25 FTE	(11)
	Redirected special education transportation costs to special education budget	(22)
	Reduced equipment purchases	(59)
	No requested capital outlay in FY 05	(55)
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>1,183</b>

<b>Talbot County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	1
	<b>Year 2</b>	1
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Talbot County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realigning staff to maintain the maximum classroom teacher support. This realignment required the elimination of approximately 30.5 central office positions and redistribution of work.</li> <li>• Deploying building managers to all schools to remove the management of the facility function from the principal.</li> <li>• Focusing the system on student learning rather than the process of teaching. As such, teachers and staff examine what students have learned and its retention.</li> </ul>		

<b>Washington County</b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$160,251
	Fiscal 2005	\$169,778
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$9,527</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>6,436</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	5,204
	Health insurance premiums	525
	Contractual increases	141
	Inflationary increases	11
	Software maintenance and technology contracts	38
	Nonpublic placements	70
	Vehicle replacements	192
	School safety	100
	Utilities	155
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>254</b>
	Digital Printing Program at Technical High School	219
	Paperless Board Meeting program	8
	Expand Middle School Saturday drop out program	10
	Expand High School Saturday twilight program	10
	Travel expenses for Robotics Team	7
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>2,937</b>
	Central office staff (3.2 FTE)	141
	Assistant principals (3 FTE)	195
	Elementary fine arts staff (6 FTE)	275
	Elementary, middle and high school staff (28.4 FTE)	1,450
	Contractual positions (3 FTE)	42
	Additional compensation for expanded day and extended year	282
	At-risk instructional staff (8.7 FTE)	191
	Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten staff (8 FTE)	248
	Other positions (1.6 FTE)	113
<b>Revised Strategies</b>		<b>3,280</b>
	Technology upgrade and parent access software	1,690
	Increase textbooks, instructional materials and equipment	1,554
	Contracted consultants	5
	Increase advertising for highly qualified staff	20
	Stipends for improved communications	12
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(4,191)</b>
	Eliminated positions or programs	(139)
	Reductions in costs	(1,911)
	Decreases in expenditures or program savings	(2,141)
<b>Other</b>		<b>812</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>9,527</b>

<b>Washington County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends the Washington County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Practicing a belief system among all county educators that "Every student must get it." Washington County educators have named this approach a "Push in Beliefs." This approach of working with each student's needs has helped in making progress with every subgroup. The system emphasizes the switch from a focus on the teaching to a focus on what students are learning through the saying "Teaching to Learning."</li> <li>Utilizing an instructional intervention plan that stresses increasing levels of intervention with differing activities and strategies for each student based on specific instructional needs of individual students.</li> </ul>		

<b>Wicomico County</b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$117,116
	Fiscal 2005	\$124,975
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$7,859</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>4,691</b>
	COLA and scale increases and related fringe benefits	3,013
	Health insurance	1,296
	Transportation	121
	Utilities and operational costs	116
	Technology maintenance and services	92
	Instructional supplies	53
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>1,255</b>
	New elementary reading series textbooks	455
	Financial and student management software upgrades	419
	Shipping and printing center and FF &E replacement program for schools	240
	New bus routes to reduce rider time	78
	Training in scientifically based reading programs	25
	Material, equipment and stipends to align curriculum to VSC	21
	SAT prep course and PSAT testing for 10th graders	16
<b>Continued Initiatives</b>		<b>1,390</b>
	Full-day kindergarten in 4 additional schools	449
	Reassign 3 teachers to better suit student needs	146
	Supplies, materials and contracted services for instruction	105
	Computer hardware upgrades and software fees	315
	Accelerated summer programs, Destination Imagination and other programs	136
	School building renovations and repairs	164
	Staff development	75
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>1,336</b>
	Certified art teachers	156
	Math teachers (2) for increased enrollment	103
	Special ed teachers (4) and assistants (4)	297
	Assistants for full-day kindergarten (9)	196
	Other instructional and health services (3.9)	189
	Support services staff (10.5)	395
<b>Redirected Funding/ Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(884)</b>
	Redirect textbook replacement cycle to support new reading series	(320)
	Redirect 6 elementary teachers to full-day kindergarten	(292)
	Redirect 2 lab assistants to full-day kindergarten program	(41)
	Redirect 3 elementary art assistants to full-day kindergarten program	(61)
	Redirect 1 elementary and 1 evening high school teacher	(146)
	Redirect supply, consultant, printing accounts	(24)
<b>Other</b>		<b>70</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>7,859</b>

<b>Wicomico County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	1
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Wicomico County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishing as the basis for professional development for all teachers the use of research-based instructional strategies, chief among which is that students must be engaged in their learning.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding the needs of individual learners as a key component of the district's focus on differentiated instruction.</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilizing a study group approach during 2004-2005 in which all teachers and instructional administrators will read and discuss the text, <i>Differentiated Instructional Strategies</i> (Gregory and Chapman).</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilizing the Administrator's Academy (summer 2004) to continue the focus on differentiated instruction and reading and build upon the theme of differentiation in instruction.</li> </ul>		



<b><u>Worcester County</u></b>		
<b>Total Revenue (\$ in thousands)</b>		
	Fiscal 2004	\$66,124
	Fiscal 2005	\$72,139
<b>Increase (Decrease)</b>		<b>\$6,015</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
<b>Mandatory Increases</b>		<b>3,488</b>
	Salary and benefits	2,883
	Special education services	135
	Utilities and plant operations	136
	School facility improvements	334
<b>New Initiatives</b>		<b>1,233</b>
	Expanded testing program	44
	New textbooks, services, materials and equipment	192
	Reading First program	180
	Technology program	131
	Math Science Partnership Grant	200
	USDE Smaller Learning Communities	186
	21st Century Program - Grades 4 and 5	300
<b>Additional Positions</b>		<b>811</b>
	Teachers - class size and special education	448
	Coordinator of Testing Programs	77
	Pupil Personnel Worker	40
	Expanded summer programs	99
	Expanded teacher training	63
	Guidance secretary	17
	Sign Language interpreter	36
	Support staff - special education	32
<b>Other</b>		<b>483</b>
<b>Total Change</b>		<b>6,015</b>

<b>Worcester County School System Improvement</b>		
Has the school system been identified for:	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Improvement?		✓
Corrective Action?		✓
<b>School Improvement</b>		
	<b>Number of Schools in School Improvement</b>	
	<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>
	<b>Year 1</b>	0
	<b>Year 2</b>	0
	<b>Corrective Action</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Planning)</b>	0
	<b>Restructuring (Implementing)</b>	0
<b>Reviewers' Commendations</b>		
The review panel commends Worcester County Public Schools for:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balancing specific actions that contributed to performance, including curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development and the organization of the school day.</li> <li>Including Special Education in all professional development workshops.</li> <li>Working with community partners to provide faith-based after-school programs for students.</li> <li>Implementing student profile sheets that allow teachers to collect data and apply Individual Student Learning Plans for all students.</li> <li>Focusing on early intervention through Head Start and Judy Centers before students enter school.</li> <li>Requiring schools to earn accreditation from the Middle State Association of Schools and Colleges.</li> <li>Surveying all parents asking what can be done to improve the school system and considering input from parents in the early stages of the budgetary process.</li> </ul>		

## GLOSSARY

1. **AYP:** Adequate Yearly Progress designed so that all students and student groups will reach proficiency in reading and math by 2014.
2. **School System in Improvement:** School systems not making AYP for two consecutive years will be identified for School System Improvement<sup>12</sup>. They must revise their Master Plans and notify parents of their School System Improvement status. The Maryland State Department of Education will provide technical assistance to these school systems. School systems not making AYP for two consecutive years after being identified for School System Improvement are subject to Corrective Action from the state, which must do at least one of the following:
  - a. Defer, reduce, or redirect state funds.
  - b. Order school systems to adopt a new curriculum aligned with the voluntary state curriculum.
  - c. Order school systems to replace school principals and executive officers relevant to the failure to make AYP.
  - d. Remove schools from local school board control.
  - e. Order a reorganization that clusters specified schools under an executive officer approved by the state.
  - f. Abolish or restructure the school system (requires legislative authorization).
3. **Local School System Transition:** A transition policy was been established to move school systems into the state's improvement process.
  - a. School systems will be identified for Corrective Action during the 2003-2004 school year if, as of January 8, 2002, they had 25% or more of schools under local or state reconstitution for more than three school years.
  - b. School systems will be identified for improvement during the 2003-2004 school year if they have 25% or more of schools newly identified for School Improvement or Corrective Action as of September 1, 2003.
3. **School Improvement:** A school is identified for school improvement after it has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years<sup>13</sup>.
4. **School in Improvement (Year 1):** During the first year in school improvement, Title 1 schools must provide students the option of transferring to a higher performing school. School staff must develop a two-year school improvement plan, setting aside 10%

---

<sup>12</sup> Excerpt taken from: [Understanding Adequate Yearly Progress](#) (*Acrobat 340 kb*)

<sup>13</sup> Maryland Report Card website ([www.mdreportcard.org](http://www.mdreportcard.org)) 2004

of Title I funds for professional development, extended learning time (school day or school year), parent involvement initiatives, and new-teacher mentoring. The school system must help school staff analyze test data, improve teacher training, and better allocate resources.

5. **School in Improvement (Year 2):** During the second consecutive year in school improvement, the state must provide Title 1 students the transfer option plus supplemental services.

6. **Corrective Action:** During the third year, districts must take corrective action in any school-Title I or not-that fails to improve. This action could be replacing staff relative to the school's continued failure; implementing a new curriculum; decreasing school-level management authority; extending the school day or year; appointing an outside expert to advise school staff; or reorganizing the school internally.

7. **Restructuring – Planning:** During the fourth year, districts must plan for the alternative governance of all failing schools. This could mean reopening the school as a charter school, replacing the school's principal and staff, contracting for private management, or allowing state takeover.

8. **Restructuring – Implementing:** During the fifth year, districts must implement the restructuring plan called for in year four.

9. **Exiting School Improvement:** After one year of making AYP, the school holds its status in the improvement process. If it makes AYP the next year, it will exit. If it does not make AYP, it will move to the next step in the improvement process. If, after exiting, a school does not make AYP for two consecutive years, it will enter the improvement process from the beginning.

10. **Transition into School Improvement:** A transition policy was established to move schools into the state's new improvement process.

- a. Any school not identified for improvement or reconstitution as of January 2002 has a "clean slate." A school not meeting the 2002-2003 baseline will be considered to have not made AYP. If it does not make AYP in 2003-2004, it will be identified for School Improvement.
- b. Schools under local or state reconstitution for one or two years as of January 8, 2002, are considered to have been in School Improvement for the corresponding number of years during the 2002-2003 school year. If these schools do not meet the 2002-2003 baseline, they will be considered to have not made AYP and will advance to the next level in the process, i.e., a second year of School Improvement or Corrective Action.
- c. Schools under local or state reconstitution for three or more years as of January 8, 2002, are considered to have been in Corrective Action during the 2002-2003 school year. If they do not meet the 2002-2003 baseline, they will be identified for Restructuring.

- d. Title 1 schools under School Improvement or Corrective Action as of January 2002 remained at this status during the 2002-2003 school year. If they do not meet the 2002-2003 baseline, they will be considered to have not made AYP and will advance to the next step of the improvement process.
11. **VSC:** Voluntary State Curriculum developed by the Maryland State Department of Education in collaboration with local school system staff and statewide education advocates to assist local school systems in improving the academic achievement of all students.